



RIVER FOREST DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING AGENDA

A meeting of the River Forest Development Review Board will be held on Thursday, July 26, 2018 at 7:30 P.M. in First Floor Community Room of the Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

- I. Call to Order/Roll Call
- II. Approval of Minutes of the June 21, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting
- III. Approval of Minutes of the June 28, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting
- IV. Public Hearing – Application #18-02 – Application for Planned Development to Construct a Five-Story Mixed Use Building with Residential and Commercial Uses at 7601-7613 Lake Street, 7617-7621 Lake Street, and 423 Ashland Avenue.
- V. Discussion/Deliberation & Recommendation - Application #18-02 – Application for Planned Development to Construct a Five-Story Mixed Use Building with Residential and Commercial Uses at 7601-7613 Lake Street, 7617-7621 Lake Street, and 423 Ashland Avenue.
- VI. Approval of Findings of Fact - Application #18-02 – Application for Planned Development to Construct a Five-Story Mixed Use Building with Residential and Commercial Uses at 7601-7613 Lake Street, 7617-7621 Lake Street, and 423 Ashland Avenue.
- VII. Public Comment
- VIII. Adjournment

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
June 21, 2018**

A meeting of the Village of River Forest Development Review Board was held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 21, 2018 in the Community Room of the River Forest Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following persons were:

Present: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, and Chairman Martin

Absent: Members Fishman, Ruehle and Ryan

Also Present: Assistant Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner, Planning Consultant John Houseal, Village Attorney Greg Smith

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2018 DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

A MOTION was made by Member O'Brien and SECONDED by Member Dombrowski to approve the minutes of the May 3, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting as amended.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

III. PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICATION #18-03 - AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO ADD CELLULAR ANTENNAS TO PARKING GARAGE - CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

Assistant Village Administration Scheiner administered the oath and notified those who would testify at the public hearing were reminded that the River Forest Village Code makes it unlawful for any person to knowingly make a false statement of material fact to the Village in connection with any application, report, affidavit, oath, certification and attestation. Violations are punishable as a petty offense with a fine.

Glen Steiner, Concordia University, said the purpose of the application is to improve Verizon coverage in the area to benefit the campus, students, faculty, staff and the surrounding community where Verizon coverage is currently limited. He said an amendment was approved in 2010 to increase the height of the southwest corner of the parking garage to allow antenna from T-Mobile and AT&T. Mr. Steiner said this project will put a stealth enclosure at the southeast corner of the parking structure that will increase its height from approximately 44 feet to 54 feet. He said they believe it will blend in nicely and will not be obtrusive or problematic for neighbors. Mr. Steiner presented a photo of the existing parking structure and a rendering showing what it will look like if the stealth enclosure is installed. He described the configuration of the antenna array and noted that it will not be visible to any surrounding properties. He stated that a smaller stealth enclosure will also be located

on the west staircase on the exterior of the western facing wall of the parking structure and that it will match the existing façade of that stair tower.

Mr. Steiner said that the location that has been selected on level five requires one parking space and that the University will add one parking space elsewhere on campus so they do not impact parking capacity. He said Verizon is requiring its own fiber which will be brought in underground via their own fiber box in the parkway and their own raceway underground, which was the subject of an amendment to the application that was submitted to the Village on June 20, 2018.

Mr. Steiner said there is a letter from Grimes Real Estate in the application which states that the application will have no adverse impact on the surrounding community. He said there will be no increased demand on Village services. Mr. Steiner noted that, during the technical review meeting with Village Staff, the Police Chief noted that improved Verizon coverage in the area would also improve police communications in that area. Mr. Steiner said that Verizon sent a letter indicating that they have the financial capacity to complete the project and that the University is not investing any of its own money in the construction.

Mr. Crosby asked if there is not enough room in the existing west stair case enclosure to locate the new antenna. Mr. Steiner said that Verizon could not install the antenna in the directions needed at that location and that is why they needed to locate them at the southeast corner.

Tom Zimmerman, Terra Consulting Group, stated T-Mobile is located on the inside of the existing stealth enclosure and they have existing cabinets with all of their radio and antenna equipment. He said there is no room for Verizon antennas.

In response to a question from Village Attorney Smith, Mr. Steiner stated that the existing height of the parking garage is approximately 44 feet and will increase by 10 feet to approximately 54 feet. In response to a follow up question from Village Attorney, Mr. Steiner said the exact dimensions are located in the application under Section 8, Sheet ANT-1.

Chairman Martin noted that the letter regarding the financial ability of Verizon to complete this project was dated a little more than a year ago and asked that someone update the Development Review Board on whether that has changed. Mark Layne, Insite Real Estate, said Verizon could update the letter and that he believes Verizon's financial position has not decreased since last year, but he cannot speak for Verizon.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Steiner stated that the new parking space would be located on the south edge of the current track stadium where fleet vehicles are currently parked. They will add one stall across from the maintenance building for another car to be parked there.

Ms. O'Brien stated that the Public Works Director noted in his memo that when the door to the enclosure is open it may take up two spaces. Mr. Steiner explained that the door opens into an adjacent parking space and that it cannot be moved to the north because it is on the edge of an array where it cannot be safely opened when it is turned on. Mr. Steiner also explained how their agreements with the cellular service providers require 48-hour advance

notice to come on campus to conduct non-emergency maintenance and that, in those cases, they reserve parking spaces to provide sufficient access. He said they plan to try to handle it this way with Verizon in an effort not to impact another parking space.

Assistant Village Administration Scheiner stated that the Village's Police and Fire Chiefs noted that there would be no impact to the Village's ability to deliver services. She said the Public Works Director submitted two memos. The first memo, dated May 30, 2018, raises the question regarding access to the array that Mr. Steiner just discussed. It also says the project will have no impact on the Department's ability to deliver services. In response to the amendment to the application that was made on June 20, 2018, the Public Works Director reviewed it and stated that the change will not significantly impact the Village's infrastructure or ROW, and there is no objection to the modification to the application.

John Houseal, the Village's planning consultant, said that from a planning perspective there is no impact as it does not change the intensity or character of the operation of the University. He noted that from a zoning perspective it is 10-foot height increase to the southeast corner and that it is higher than what the zoning district permits, but that the southwest corner is already approximately 64 feet high. He discussed his opinion that previous height amendments to the structure mean that there is no need for a site development allowance for this application. He noted that the bump-out on the west side is de minimis. He also said the new handhole addition has no impact from a zoning perspective. In response to comment from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal reviewed the memorandum he drafted and clarified that the height of the southeast corner is changing.

Village Attorney Smith noted that he believes a site development allowance of 10 feet is required to increase the garage height. He stated that relief from the height requirement was previously granted but that it does not allow the University to build within that 65-foot box as they see fit. He said the legal notice and application are sufficient to allow the site development allowance. Mr. Smith continued that the Planned Development Ordinance says modification of a structure subject to a planned development has to come before the Development Review Board, so whether or not the site development allowance is required is irrelevant in some ways, however, the findings of fact include a recitation that a site development allowance should be granted for height. Mr. Houseal stated that he defers to the attorney's legal interpretation.

There were no additional public comments. Chairman Marin closed the public hearing.

IV. DISCUSSION/DELIBERATION/RECOMMENDATION – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO ADD CELLULAR ANTENNAS TO PARKING GARAGE – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

A MOTION was made by Member Dombrowski and SECONDED by Member Crosby to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees that this amendment to the planned development application be approved.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

V. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT - AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO ADD CELLULAR ANTENNAS TO PARKING GARAGE – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

Chairman Martin stated that he would like to defer the approval of the Findings of Fact to the Development Review Board's June 28, 2018 meeting.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING – APPLICATION #18-04 – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT ONE-STORY WALKWAY BETWEEN CHRISTOPHER CENTER AND WEST ANNEX – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

Mr. Steiner stated that the University recently renovated the first floor of the West Annex which led to the installation of a new exit on the west side of that building and that they intended to put a covered canopy over a pedestrian walkway between buildings to provide shelter from the elements. He said a donor stepped forward and proposed an enclosed walkway with an approximate value of \$400,000. Mr. Steiner said that, in response to a comment at the pre-filing meeting, they visited with the Building Official Clifford Radatz who confirmed that not every entrance to a building must be handicapped accessible. Mr. Steiner said both West Annex and the Christopher Center have alternative handicapped access.

Mr. Steiner said the new walkway would allow someone to travel from the Christopher Center, which is on the far west end of campus, to the library which is located on the far east edge of the campus, without having to be outside in the elements. Mr. Steiner said the single-story walkway will be 14 feet 11 inches wide and made with glass and bronze metal framing. He said it will be similar to a connection that was recently constructed between the new residence hall and the existing Mary Martha Hall.

Mr. Steiner said the construction timeframe is about 10 weeks and they hope to start construction in the late summer or early fall so the project is complete before the snow flies. He presented a map that showed the location of the proposed enclosed walkway and said it will be located about 315 feet from Augusta Street. He said they do not believe it will be obtrusive, unattractive, disruptive to surrounding properties. Mr. Steiner noted that, after the pre-filing conference, the contractor noted that one tree is in the way of construction and would need to be removed. Mr. Steiner said they will replace that tree on a caliper inch by caliper inch basis and noted the location of the new trees on the landscape plan. He also presented images and perspectives from and of the new walkway.

In response to a questions from Chairman Martin and Mr. Crosby, Mr. Steiner confirmed that the location of doors from the buildings to the proposed walkway. He also described how existing doors are used for ingress/egress to a children's play area and the security features that are in place. He described the ingress/egress and access plan for those areas to and from the proposed walkway.

Chairman Martin noted that in addition to being 300' off of Augusta, there are two metal fences, trees, and shrubs between the parking lot and where the structure will be.

In response to a question from Member O'Brien regarding the construction crew's impact on parking, Mr. Steiner described the areas where construction crews will park.

In response to a question from Mr. Crosby, Mr. Steiner said the glass will be tinted lightly and coated with low-e.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin regarding the project's financing, Mr. Steiner stated that the University has already received and cashed the donor's check and has the money on hand to complete the project.

Assistant Village Administration Scheiner stated that she has a memo from the Police Chief, Public Works Director and Fire Chief indicating that there will be no impact on the Village's ability to deliver services as a result of the construction of this new building and that any concerns can be addressed through the building permitting process.

Chairman Martin noted that the Fire Chief raised an issue in his memo regarding signage. Ms. Scheiner stated, and Mr. Steiner confirmed, the matter was discussed during technical review and the applicant agreed to comply with what the Fire Chief requested.

Mr. Houseal stated that the proposed walkway does not intensify or change the use of the university and enhances pedestrian environment on campus. It is almost invisible from any adjacent property and public right-of-ways, and has no visual or functional impact on the campus or surrounding properties.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal confirmed that this is considered a building under the Village's code and that it requires a major amendment even though it is not programmable or occupiable. In response to a follow-up question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal agreed with Mr. Steiner's analysis that the building has to be ADA compliant but not every single egress has to be. Mr. Houseal said that there are no site development allowances are required. He also confirmed that the structure is in keeping with the PRI Zoning District and complies with the comprehensive plan as it improves pedestrian environment and connectivity of the campus.

There were no additional public comments. Chairman Marin closed the public hearing.

VII. DISCUSSION/DELIBERATION/RECOMMENDATION – APPLICATION #18-04 – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMNT TO CONSTRUCT ONE-STORY WALKWAY BETWEEN CHRISTOPHER CENTER AND WEST ANNEX – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGSUTA)

Mr. Crosby stated that he believes this is appropriate architecturally.

A MOTION was made by Member O'Brien and SECONDED by Member Crosby to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees that this amendment to the planned development application be approved.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, Fishman, O'Brien, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

VIII. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT – APPLICATION #18-04 – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMNT TO CONSTRUCT ONE-STORY WALKWAY BETWEEN CHRISTOPHER CENTER AND WEST ANNEX – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGSUTA)

Chairman Martin stated that he would like to defer the approval of the Findings of Fact to the Development Review Board's June 28, 2018 meeting.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

X. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Member Crosby and SECONDED by Member Fishman to adjourn the meeting of the Development Review Board at 8:16 p.m.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, Fishman, O'Brien, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Ms. Scheiner announced that the June 28, 2018 public hearing will be held at Concordia University and noted that there is a link on the Village's website to the campus map.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lisa Scheiner
Secretary

Frank R. Martin
Chairman, Development Review Board

Date

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
June 28, 2018**

A meeting of the Village of River Forest Development Review Board was held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 28, 2018 in the Oak Park River Forest Room of the Koehneke Community Center on the Concordia University Chicago campus, 7400 Augusta Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:33 p.m. Upon roll call, the following persons were present:

Present: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, Ryan (arrived at 7:52 p.m.), and Chairman Martin
Absent: Members Fishman and Ryan
Also Present: Assistant Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner, Village Engineer Jeff Loster, Deputy Police Chief Dan Dhooghe, Fire Chief Kurt Bohlmann, Village Administrator Eric Palm, Planning Consultant John Houseal, Village Attorney Greg Smith

II. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT – APPLICATION #18-03 - AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO ADD CELLULAR ATENNAS TO PARKING GARAGE – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

A MOTION was made by Member Ruehle and SECONDED by Member O'Brien to adopt the findings of fact and recommended approval of Planned Development amendment application.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, and Chairman Martin
Nays: None
Motion Passed.

III. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT – APPLICATION #18-04 – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMNT TO CONSTRUCT ONE-STORY WALKWAY BETWEEN CHRISTOPHER CENTER AND WEST ANNEX – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGSUTA)

A MOTION was made by Member O'Brien and SECONDED by Member Dombrowski to adopt the findings of fact and recommended approval of Planned Development amendment application.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, and Chairman Martin
Nays: None
Motion Passed.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING – APPLICATION #18-02 – APPLICATION FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT A FIVE-STORY MIXED USE BUILDING WITH RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USES AT 7601-7613 LAKE STREET, 7617-7621 LAKE STREET, AND 423 ASHLAND AVENUE.

Chairman Martin explained the process that would be followed to conduct the public hearing. Assistant Village Administrator Scheiner read the admonition and swore in all parties wishing to speak.

Eric Christman, Sedgewick Developers, presented the development plan for the southwest corner of Lake Street and Lathrop Avenue. He stated that the parcels are currently zoned C-3 Central Commercial and that the area along Lake Street is commercial with residential uses. He said the proposed development site consists of three parcels of land over 36,400 square feet or about $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre. He reviewed the existing landscaping that they plan to keep the same but and noted that they plan to remove one tree along Ashland Avenue. Mr. Christman said the site will feature two residential entrances along Lake Street leading to four private elevators with direct access to the units. He noted that they will provide two vehicle entrances to reduce congestion. One entrance will be located along Ashland Avenue and the other will be located along Lathrop Avenue for retail tenants and some residents. He reviewed the location of the entrances on the site plan. Mr. Christman stated that they have moved the property back off the property line to improve site lines for pedestrian traffic and extending the sidewalk by four to five inside the property line. He said they will have an outdoor promenade for pedestrian traffic. The development will be about 207 lineal feet long on Lake Street and 100 lineal feet long on Lathrop Avenue.

Mr. Christman discussed the background of Sedgewick properties as a design-builder and developer and other properties they're working on in the Chicagoland area including the Bentham, a 30-unit condominium project at Erie and LaSalle, a 60-unit luxury apartment project at 1325 N. Wells, a 69-unit luxury apartment project at 301 North Avenue, a 30-unit luxury apartment project at 1545 North Avenue, and a 17-unit condominium project at 1611 N. Hermitage.

Mr. Christman said they proposed to demolish the LaMajada building and clean up a contaminated site to EPA standards and bring a lifestyle, mixed-use development that will rejuvenate, energize and brighten Lake Street in River Forest.

He said the five-story mixed use project will include 32 residential units and 86 parking spaces, 32 of which will be for retail and 54 for residential. He said the exterior will be at traditional design with cast stone, fenestrations and accents. Balconies will maximize light and the exterior will blend in with neighboring buildings. There will be eight residential units per floor ranging from two to four bedrooms per unit. He discussed the various amenities in each unit and noted that they have a sales office open on Lake Street and are accepting contracts.

Mr. Christman said that there will be 14,400 square feet of retail space divided between three to eight tenants ranging in size from 800 to 8,000 square feet and will feature boutique shops and dining. He said the retail ceiling height will be 20 feet which will allow a two level

parking garage in the back. He said the addition of on-site parking will ease congestion and traffic along Lake Street, Lathrop and Ashland Avenues.

Mr. Christman reviewed the site development allowance (SDA) requested for density (the number of units). They are allowed 13 and are proposing 32. He discussed the parking 87 parking spaces required for the residential units and visitors well as the fact that no on-site parking is required for the retail tenants. He said they are providing 86 spaces, 32 of which will be for the commercial tenants and 54 for the residential tenants. Mr. Christman also discussed the SDA requested for the proposed building height. He said their intent is to fit into the surrounding area and to satisfy today's demand for 10 foot ceilings. He described a survey they had done showing different buildings within the area and how they compare. He said many of the buildings predate 2000 when eight to nine foot ceilings are the norm.

Mr. Christman concluded his presentation by summarizing his comments as well as their goals for the development.

Fire Chief Kurt Bohlmann stated that he and Fire Marshal Wiley reviewed the proposed development and stated their only concern was about the light shafts in between units since there is no access to them other than through windows. He said that if there is some sort of fire it would be difficult to access, however, installation of fire sprinklers in the shafts should alleviate the problem. In response to questions from Chairman Martin, Chief Bohlmann responded that the entire building will have a sprinkler system. In response to a follow-up question, Chief Bohlmann confirmed that the Fire Department has sufficient personnel and equipment through auto-aid agreements to respond to a disaster at this building.

Deputy Police Chief Dan Dhooghe stated the Police Department has no immediate concerns but suggested camera systems for exterior security and security within the parking garage such as call boxes. In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Deputy Chief Dhooghe stated that to his knowledge the suggestions that were made have been incorporated into the plan.

Village Engineer Jeff Loster stated that the public works-related issues can be addressed during the permitting phase. He said there was some concern about turning radius within commercial parking area. Mr. Loster also said that the Village's consultant reviewed the water infrastructure and determined that it is adequate to support the new development without requiring any off-site improvements. In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Loster stated that the plan shows the development tying into the electrical into the street light system, which would not be allowed, but that it can be cleared up during the permitting phase.

John Houseal, the Village's planning consultant, reviewed the report that he provided to the Development Review Board. He reviewed existing site conditions noting that the property is zoned C-3, Central Commercial District which is intended to be a mixed use district at the heart of the Village with commercial on the ground floor with residential and/or office above. He described the neighboring properties which are zoned C-3, ORIC and PRI, as well as the current uses on those properties.

Mr. Houseal asked the applicant to identify the specific uses or range of uses that they want to be considered in this space so that the Village knows what it is approving, specifically, or an envelope of possibility, and also to prevent the applicant from having to return to public hearing if they have a tenant that is identified as a not permitted or special use. He said the comprehensive plan expresses a preference for retail on the ground floor at this location. While other uses are listed the primary objective of this is to create an exciting pedestrian environment with retail and restaurant and to use this as an economic development engine to bolster sales tax revenue. As a result, Mr. Houseal stated that he prefers that a bank not be approved as part of the development on the ground floor noting that there are other banks nearby. He said if a bank is to be considered as a potential tenant, that the Development Review Board place a condition of approval that a bank not be allowed to occupy the prominent corner spot.

Mr. Houseal presented the zoning analysis portion of his report. He noted the site development allowance sought for density/total unit count. He explained that the zoning code requires 2,800 of land area per unit and they would be allowed 13 units, however, they are proposing 32. This results in 1,138 square feet of land area per unit. He asked for the attorney's recommendation on how the SDA should be noted if the project is approved. In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal clarified that he is not talking about the area within the unit itself but the area of land on the underlying lot. Density is 146% over what the code allows.

In response to a question from Mr. Ruehle, Mr. Houseal noted that previously approved planned developments cannot be used as a justification for a decision later. He said that condominium buildings in the 400 block of Lathrop and Ashland also exceeded the height restriction in the zoning district by three to seven feet. He stated that the building on Lathrop also exceeds the density allowed and that site development allowances were granted. He said other buildings in that area range in height from 45 to 60 feet but he is not certain of the density of the buildings on Central Avenue.

Mr. Houseal said that there is no setback requirement in the Village Center area along Lake Street and the project meets or exceeds those requirements. He said there is an approximately five-foot setback on the east side of the building to provide more visibility on Lathrop.

Mr. Houseal reviewed the bulk of the building, which he describes as the perceived visual impact of the building which is typically a combination of height, floor area ratio, lot coverage, and setbacks. He reviewed the zoning requirements and said the floor area ratio and lot coverage are in compliance. He said the open air balconies and parking on the back side do not count toward the floor area ratio calculation. He said the proposed height of the building, which is measured to the highest point of the building, is 80 feet and exceeds the 50-foot height restriction in this zoning district and a site development allowance of 30 feet is requested. He said the top of the parapet is 74 feet but to the top of the decorative piece at the northeast corner it is 80 feet.

He said there are other buildings in the Village Center and in this area that have been approved at higher densities, not the same extent, but allowances have been granted.

Mr. Houseal presented his parking analysis. He said the applicant is required to provide 80 off-street parking spaces for the residential units, seven designated off-street guest spaces, and zero off-street spaces for the commercial units. He said that in most downtowns, ground floor retail, commercial, and service uses don't require parking because in most downtowns it can't be built on the site. He said they are proposing a total of 86 off-street parking spaces which requires a de minimis site development of one parking space overall. However, Mr. Houseal said they are designating 54 parking space for residential units, 32 spaces for commercial units, and no spaces for guest parking. As a result, a site development allowance is required for the number of residential unit and guest parking spaces. He said that although the commercial spaces are not required he thinks it is a good idea to provide them. He noted that the national trend is to provide fewer spaces, however, he is concerned about the allocation of spaces, the provision of fewer than two spaces per unit for three and four bedroom units, and the lack of designated guest parking.

Mr. Houseal also reviewed the requested site development allowance for parking stall depth and aisle width. He said the zoning ordinance in River Forest requires a stall depth of 18.42 feet. The applicant is proposing an 18-foot stall depth, which he said is not a problem. He also said the ordinance requires a 25-foot drive aisle. The applicant is proposing a 22-foot aisle, which also is not a problem.

In response to a question from Ms. Ryan regarding the current uses and parking, Mr. Houseal said surface parking in the rear of existing commercial buildings is a common configuration in the Village Center area. He said he is not concerned about the configuration of retail use in the front and structure parking in the rear. He noted that the ground floor parking coming in off Lathrop houses 42 parking spaces which is a combination of residential, commercial and guest and assumes that residential spaces will be designated. Mr. Houseal said he is concerned that since it is a stubbed parking lot, when a driver enters and sees that there is no parking available, that driver will have to perform a three-point turnaround to exit with cars having pulled up behind that vehicle. He said he is also concerned about the security of residential parking spaces and that most high-end owners demand secure enclosed parking. He stated that there will be a shared parking arrangement for guests and commercial customers. He is concerned that owners who cannot find parking in the garage will park on the street where overnight parking is not allowed.

Mr. Houseal suggested that a rumble strip, mirror, or something else be installed at the parking exit on Lathrop as a safety precaution for the area where vehicles entering/exiting the building and pedestrians intersect. Mr. Ruehle described difficulties turning left onto Lathrop and suggested restricting it to right turn only. Mr. Houseal suggested that restricting the turning movements might have an impact on nearby streets.

Mr. Houseal discussed the character of the development and notes that there are no Village requirements or restrictions. He said that he applauds many aspects of this proposal such as the investment in the area and the environmental contamination that will be cleaned up. He said there are different opinions on the design of the building and the architect on the Development Review Board can address that.

Mr. Houseal said that other buildings that have been granted relief on the height restrictions in the Village Center area are not right on the sidewalk. He described the heights and

conditions of Mark Menna's building and another building on Lathrop Avenue. He said the proposed building will be approximately 200' long on the sidewalk and noted that the Drummond building is a little longer than this but is only about three stories tall. Mr. Houseal said that the visual impact of this building doesn't exist elsewhere in the Village Center. He described the building height and background of the condominium building at Lake and William. He said when the Development Review Board and Village considers the application they don't just look at the existing buildings in the Village Center and that new investment cannot be couched on what's been done in the past, however, the Village should take into consideration the building in the context of the area. He said there may be some modifications and fine-tuning that can be done to help it fit in better, depending on what the definition of "fit" is.

Mr. Houseal addressed the photometric plan that was submitted and reviewed and described the difference between line of sight and illumination. He said all proposed lighting is appropriate, that it will not glare into adjacent properties, and that the photometric plan is consistent with other commercial uses.

In response to a question from Mr. Ruehle, Mr. Houseal said he has not looked at the traffic study in detail but can do so if directed.

In response to a question from Mr. Crosby, Mr. Houseal stated that the applicant submitted the application and then he prepared his report so they have not had an opportunity to incorporate a response to his comments in their submittal.

Ms. Ryan stated that the applicant is not requesting setback variation but there is concern about it being too close to the sidewalk. Mr. Houseal said not necessarily and discussed the length of the building that houses Elan salon. He described the area of tactile perception from the pedestrian perspective being about 18 to 20 feet tall and that nothing is picked up above 35 feet. He said a building at the sidewalk is ok and building length is ok, but the height, setback, etc. is taken into consideration together. He noted that the diversity and quality of buildings is a defining characteristic of the community.

Mr. Ruehle pointed out that the first three bays are an arcade that are open and people can walk in that space. Eric Christman stated that those bays are approximately eight to 13 feet deep.

In response to a question from Ms. O'Brien regarding safety concerns at the Ashland Avenue exit, Mr. Houseal said the same concerns apply. However, he noted that parking circulation geometry for residents can be a little bit tighter because they learn to navigate the movement. He said he is more concerned about customers coming in and out. He said Lake and Lathrop is a controlled intersection and traffic is funneled intentionally because of the signalization, and there is a greater concentration of pedestrian activity. He said there is also activity on Ashland but it is heightened on Lathrop.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin regarding umbrellas, tables, etc. being located in the public right-of-way, Mr. Houseal agreed and said canopies might be as well. He stated that the hallmark of a successful downtown is outdoor dining. He said he would

have to review the Village's regulations on outdoor dining. He said if it can be accommodated with a three to four passage for ADA compliance, it will be a good thing. In response to a question from Mr. Ruhele regarding whether outdoor dining could be accommodated on Lathrop, Mr. Houseal said it might accommodate something but it's a tight corner he'd have to look at the geometry as well as how it would be approved. Chairman Martin noted that LaMajada had outdoor dining but it's on their property. Mr. Houseal said Panera has it as well but it's on private property. Mr. Ruehle said the cigar shop has seats outside. Houseal noted that they're not eating.

Luay Aboona, Traffic Engineer from KLOA, presented a summary of his traffic report for the proposed development. He said they looked at key intersections surrounding the site as well as its proximity to the church and schools. He said that from 8-8:30 a.m. and 3-3:30 p.m. there is a lot of traffic and children in the area that influence how the intersections operate. He said there are also crossing guards on Lake Street at Ashland and Franklin that also influence how traffic operates. He stated that sometimes they are over eager to stop the traffic to let pedestrians cross or they regulate some of the traffic movements and there are a lot of backups that occur on Lake, Ashland and Lathrop. Mr. Aboona continued that from an overall trip generation standpoint, they don't anticipate it to be a high traffic generator given the number of residential units and given the fact that it's replacing active uses which are already generating traffic. He said that increase in traffic will be 1% or less and this translates into a very low impact development. He said the Village will not see a major change in the operation of those intersections in terms of level of service or delay. Mr. Aboona said that the making a left turn onto Lathrop from the site will be challenging at certain times of the day, particularly during rush hour. KLOA recommends that, rather than imposing a no left turn restriction initially, it should be allowed to operate and restricted through signage during rush hour at a later date. He said it will probably be self-regulated through driver behavior. He agreed that there may be a ripple effect of increasing volumes on other streets and intersections, but given the low volume of traffic they don't consider that to be significant. Mr. Aboona said that KLOA also recommends some sort of warning device at the entrance/exit on Lathrop Avenue that alerts pedestrians to vehicles. He said the entrance/exit on Ashland will have a garage door and primarily be used by residents who will have a fob or remote to open it as they approach. He said it will be a more controlled environment and does not believe there is a need for a warning device.

Chairman Martin asked if there was any benefit of a gate for the exit onto Lathrop that would be operated by pushing a button rather than using a fob to slow the driver and give a pedestrian more of a warning. Mr. Aboona said that could be installed and also suggested that a gate with a sensor that delays the opening could be considered in addition to the visual warning device. In response to a follow-up question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Aboona said he did not consider the impact on traffic during the construction of this building, just at full build out.

Mr. Ruehle asked for clarification and noted the behavior of the crossing guards conflicting with the signalization on Lathrop that can create substantial back-ups. Although it is not related to the development, he asked if it would make sense to provide a flashing pedestrian crossing signal at Lake and Ashland that is functional during school drop-off and pick-up times and synchronized with the traffic light at Lake and Lathrop. Mr. Aboona said it would

have to be determined whether the criteria for the MUTCD have been met to warrant that type of signal.

In response to a question from Mr. Crosby, Mr. Aboona confirmed that the Village and School District 90 have engaged in a safe walking routes to school study. Mr. Crosby asked if any of the results from the changes that will be recommended had been incorporated. Ms. Scheiner said not yet as the study results will be coming in the next month or so.

Mr. Ruehle noted that the four-way intersection at Central and Lathrop might be another point where change might improve traffic flow in the area. Mr. Aboona said they looked at that and it is limited given the width of the bridge.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin regarding the sufficiency of 54 residential parking spaces for 32 units, Mr. Aboona said there is a trend to provide less parking with residential developments. He said they reviewed criteria in other publications such as the Institute of Traffic Engineers *Parking Generation* Manual, which recommends 1.38 parking spaces per unit with a maximum of 1.5 spaces. He said the proposal falls within that range. He noted that retail parking can be shared during off peak hours when there is no demand for it. He said that during the night there is the ability for residents to share spaces when they are not in use by the retail tenants.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Ms. Scheiner stated that there were no further staff or consultant reports.

Chairman Martin invited members of the public to address the Development Review Board.

Matthew Patterson, 7575 Lake Street, states that he thinks it would be appropriate to stay in the height range of the buildings in the area which are approximately 55 to 65 feet tall. He said the proposed building height puts the building out of scale. He said he also does not think it blends in with the aesthetic of the area and that it is not conducive to a pedestrian feel. He said he is concerned about the shadow the building will cast along Lake Street. He said the applicant's statement that buyers expect a ten-foot ceiling height is subjective and there are very nice condominiums in the area that do not have ten foot ceilings. Mr. Patterson said he does not think there is enough room on the sidewalk for outdoor dining.

Julie Patterson, 7575 Lake Street, addressed standard K in section 10-19-3 of the planned development ordinance. She said she and her husband are grateful for the five-foot setback on Lathrop as it will somewhat ease traffic flow. She said she crosses the Lake and Lathrop intersection at least three times a day and has observed pedestrian and vehicle traffic at various times. She said pedestrians include children, adults, and senior citizens and she is concerned that the traffic study did not include the increase in pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the summer. She said crossing at the intersections in this area she needs to pay close attention as many drivers are distracted. Ms. Patterson stated her concerns about pedestrian safety in the areas of the entrance/exit areas for resident parking, the loading dock and garbage pick-up. She said she didn't see any reference to the times for trash pick-up or supply delivery. She also commented on the crossing guards on Lake Street and said if they waited for four or five people rather than stopping traffic for one or two it might improve traffic flow. Ms. Patterson said she is also concerned about the length of the retail pass-

through as it makes her nervous for people passing through during the day and employees at night.

Ed McDevitt, 411 Ashland, said the proposed building abuts their parking lot, almost right up to the lot line, with very little space in between. He said they recently installed safety lights to illuminate the parking lot and he wants to make sure they aren't damaged or removed. He also said turning left onto Lathrop is nearly impossible. He said he also worries about cars leaving/entering the building on Ashland Avenue during times with a lot of activity.

Dan Lauber, 7215 Oak, described his professional planning background, and said that he was impressed by the design portfolio of this developer. He said he is surprised that they would propose such a bulky, bland, drab design for River Forest that doesn't fit within the Village's architectural character or the character of the Village. The only distinctive thing about this building is how much it doesn't fit in. He believes they can do better and have demonstrated their ability to do so with other projects. He distributed images of other developments that illustrate other building designs that show alternating colors and articulation of the façade that break up the bulkiness of the building. Mr. Lauber said he has no problem with the height and density of the proposed development but recommended that the Development Review Board require the developer to allocate 15% of the proposed units for housing that is affordable to modest incomes and at least the median household income in River Forest. He said the Village can also place controls on price so no one makes a windfall if someone sells an affordable unit down the road. He said it is legal to do so because the Village would be giving the developer more than what is allowed and urged the Development Review Board only to grant the requested allowances if they make 15% of the units affordable. Mr. Lauber asked what the Village is doing to ensure that the building is ADA compliant. He discussed litigation with the cities of Chicago and Los Angeles for failure to enforce the ADA in new construction. Mr. Crosby, Ms. Scheiner and Mr. Ruehle explained that ADA compliance is reviewed during the building permit application and review process as well as during the inspection process, and that the Village has no authority to grant exceptions to building code requirements regarding ADA accessibility. Chairman Martin also stated that they can condition approval on compliance with applicable ADA standards.

Mark Broaddus, 538 Lathrop Avenue, doesn't support granting zoning variances. He reviewed a section of Mr. Houseal's report requiring the requested allowances and the statement that the development is an intense utilization of the site in its overall context which, to him, means the building is too big for the site. He stated his concerns regarding the quantity of off-street parking and that residents are going to have to park overnight if they do not have a space. He said he would rather the residents have parking with commercial parking on-street. Mr. Broaddus stated the building will tower over and cast a shadow all the way over St. Luke's church as well as surrounding properties. He said he wants the property developed but wants something reasonable in relation to what's there. He continued that the traffic study makes no sense to him noted that it was done in December. He said the suggestion that it will only result in a 1% increase is absurd. He described the pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the area and said that he does not believe the traffic study was done in the neighborhood he lives in. He suggested that the developer remove two floors from the building, get the parking and ingress/egress straight, and then revisit it. He said he does not know anyone that is in support of it.

Ed Voci, 624 Lathrop, stated that traffic on Lathrop backs up during peak times to his house and this will aggravate the situation. Their house was built in 1892 and they have gone to great pains to retain its character and it's made for a charming neighborhood. He would not describe this development as charming.

Ken Wiese, 411 Ashland Avenue, said most of his comments have already been covered. He said if the standard for building height has become 60 feet maybe the ordinance should be changed. He suggested fixing the ordinance but keeping the character. He said the community is 62% is single family and this development does not fit in.

Judith McDevitt, 411 Ashland Avenue, shares the concerns that have been stated. She's very concerned about egress from the garage and the traffic pattern in the garage. She said she's just heard that on the Ashland Avenue side, entrance into the building will be only the owners using a fob so it maybe that will control entrance, however, given the lack of setback there is limited visibility for motorists and pedestrians. She wants to be sure whether motorists are exiting onto Lathrop or Ashland they're doing so carefully with controlled egress.

Pat Belke, 534 Lathrop Avenue, discussed the petition regarding the shadow, church bells, and parking, and would like to ask a question regarding the subdivision of units in the condominium papers. She said when she received the post card in January she wasn't interested in a very large building on the corner but she does appreciate something going in there. She said she went door to door and started a petition dedicated exclusively regarding the height because of the shadow it would cast on the church and that it would block the light through the stained glass windows. She thinks that it gravely impacts St. Luke which will be dark, dull and depressing and the children will be in shadow all day long. She said only two people told her they don't care about the height but there are 677 people who signed the petition. She said she addressed it to Frank Martin and delivered it to the Village Hall.

Chairman Martin asked how many of those who signed the petition were River Forest residents. Ms. Belke discussed how respondents enter their information and stated that she believes the signatures represent households, not just individuals. She said all of the handwritten signatures are River Forest residents. She stated that when she circulated the petition that she only asked for people who vote to sign it since it will be presented to the Village Board.

She requested that the developer provide a shadow study. She said she thinks the building design is pretty but belongs in South Beach. She said she does not think the area can tolerate more traffic and discussed her traffic concerns. She asked if apartments could be subdivided.

In response to a follow-up question from Chairman Martin, Ms. Belke stated that to the best of her knowledge everyone that signed the petition is a River Forest resident.

Joan Cusack, address, said she lives in a building with eight foot ceilings and encouraged the developer to lower the ceiling height in order to lower the overall height of the building by eight feet. She also discussed her concerns regarding the parking supply of 1.75 spaces per unit.

MaryAnne Zee, 836 Bonnie Brae, said she is a registered architect and that supports the proposed uses but she has one concern about the character of the design and the building bulk. She said she is concerned that they are losing three well designed and detailed historic buildings and asked if the applicant considered incorporating the existing one-story commercial storefronts into their new commercial storefront. She discussed the historic building pattern on Lake Street with one story of commercial and two stories of residential above. She said that, given the heights of newer nearby buildings, more than two stories of residential above the retail is appropriate but she would like it limited to three. She asked if they're considering commercial parking spaces to be pay spaces, and whether they have any businesses interested in the retail units yet. Also, she thinks the pedestrian corridor is a potential security risk if they recapture that space they may be able to set the building back.

Carl Bergetz, 507 Lathrop, she said he thinks the development is appropriate and should be there. He requested that the traffic study be done again and thinks that it isn't an accurate estimate of the traffic impact in this location. He is concerned about pedestrian safety. He said the traffic study and impact study on the schools needs to be returned to the Board. They want development but the size of this concerns people regarding traffic, congestion, safety and impact on the schools.

Chairman Martin stated that this ends the public comment for this meeting. He said the next step is to let the applicant address the Development Review Board again and asked if his fellow Board members have any more information they'd like the applicant to provide.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Ruehle agreed that a lighting shadow study should be provided. Ms. O'Brien said a schematic of the street and the scale would be helpful. Chairman Martin clarified that the developer should provide a shadow study from a 74-foot building and 6-foot parapet with the sun to the south showing how it will impact Lake Street and the church.

Mr. Ruehle said he would like a façade scale study with adjacent buildings in the block and next block over. Mr. Crosby said that Mr. Houseal provided a diagram that shows that.

Chairman Martin said he is going to ask them who the tenants are that they're talking to and whether they're going to need variations for those uses.

Mr. Ruehle asked if the developer had given any consideration to below grade parking and, if not, asked that they do so.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Ms. Scheiner said the traffic study was ordered by the developer. Chairman Martin said that if the concern is the impact that the schools are going to have, the schools won't be back in session until the end of August. He asked if they could make some assumptions that might make the traffic study more meaningful. In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal said they could look at the traffic patterns and see if they are substantially different now versus then. He said he does not know if the comment about more activity in the summer months is factual but a study would show that. He said they would have to wait to the fall to study the impact

of student pedestrian traffic and he doesn't know if he would advise that. He said the school district may have some data on drop off/pick up that the applicant could obtain.

The members agreed they would like more information. Mr. Ruehle said asked how the safety issues for egress and the intersection of pedestrians and traffic needs to be discussed.

Chairman Martin said the hearing will be continued to give the applicant an opportunity to prepare the information requested.

A MOTION was made by Member Ruehle and SECONDED by Member O'Brien to continue the public hearing to Thursday, July 26, 2018.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, Ryan, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

V. DISCUSSION/DELIBERATION/RECOMMENDATION – APPLICATION #18-02

No action taken.

VI. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT – APPLICATION #18-02

No action taken.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

No further public comment.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Member O'Brien and SECONDED by Chairman Marti to adjourn the meeting of the Development Review Board at 10:05 p.m.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, Ryan and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lisa Scheiner
Secretary

Frank R. Martin
Chairman, Development Review Board

Date



Village of River Forest
Village Administrator's Office

400 Park Avenue
River Forest, IL 60305
Tel: 708-366-8500

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 20, 2018

To: Chairman Martin, Development Review Board

From: Lisa Scheiner, Assistant Village Administrator

Subj: Application #18-02 (Lake and Lathrop) Continued Public Hearing – July 26, 2018

During the June 28, 2018 public hearing regarding Application #18-02 the Development Review Board requested that the applicant provide the following additional items:

- A light and shadow study showing what kind of shadow would be cast by the proposed development, particularly along Lake Street.
- A statement from the applicant identifying whether they were considering any uses that are not currently expressly permitted in the land use chart
- Information regarding the pedestrian alert system at the entrances/exits along Lathrop and Ashland Avenues as well as the devices that will be used to slow traffic and enhance visibility in those locations.
- Information regarding the traffic study data used and how it compares to traffic during summer months and the school year.

In response to these requests the applicant has provided the attached letter requesting additional site development regarding the possible commercial uses. It is anticipated that the applicant will present responses to the questions regarding the traffic study as well as a copy of the light and traffic study. Staff has been advised that the applicant is working to incorporate feedback regarding the building height and intends to propose modifications to the building design to reduce its height by approximately eight feet. The applicant has advised that they will present those modifications to the Development Review Board at the hearing.



SEDGWICK
DEVELOPMENT

July 20, 2018

Mr. Frank Martin
Chairman
Development Review Board

Eric Palm
Zoning Administrator

Village of River
Forest 400 Park
Avenue
River Forest, Illinois 60305

Re: Site Development Allowances - Land Use

Dear Messrs. Martin & Palm,

Lake Lathrop Partners would like to submit for a site development allowance for the following land uses:

69	Current	Fast food establishment		N
	Changed to	Fast Casual Establishment		P

A fast-casual restaurant does not offer full table service, but advertises higher quality food than fast food restaurants, with fewer frozen or processed ingredients. It is an intermediate concept between fast food and casual dining, and usually priced accordingly with Upscale, unique or highly developed décor. (i.e. Panera Bread, Corner Bakery)

73	Current	Restaurants operating outside the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 1:00 A.M.		S
	Changed to	Restaurants operating outside the hours of 6:00 A.M. to 1:00 A.M		P

Many coffee shops or other tenants may want to open earlier in the day.

74	Current	Restaurants, sit down, greater than 5,000 square feet		S
	Changed to	Restaurants, sit down, greater than 5,000 square feet		P

The development has contiguous space of 8,000 Sq. Ft.

Attached please find the full land use per the village of River forest for C-3 Zoning.

Respectfully submitted,

LAKE LATHROP PARTNERS LLC

MK Manager Corp.

cc: Tim Hague, Lake Lathrop Partners, LLC

	10-21-3: APPENDIX A:		
	An annual review of land use chart contained in appendix A of this chapter shall be conducted no later than January 1 of every year. (Ord. 2873, 3-27-2000)		
	APPENDIX A - LAND USE CHART		
	D I S T R I C T S		
#	LAND USES		C3 Central Com- mercial
	RESIDENTIAL		
1	Dormitories		N
2	Group homes		N
3	Halfway houses		N
4	Home occupations		P
5	Multiple-family dwellings		PD
6	Multiple-family dwellings above first floor of permitted commercial or office uses		PD
7	Nursing homes and skilled care facilities		N
8	Rooming and boarding houses		N
9	Short term rental		N
10	Single-family dwelling		N
11	Single-family dwelling		N
12	Transitional housing		N
	RETAIL TRADE		
14	Adult bookstore/adult entertainment		N
15	Art dealers		P
16	Automotive parts, accessories		P
17	Boat sales and service		N
18	Book, periodical and music stores		P
19	Camera and photographic supply stores		P
20	Casket sales		P
21	Cellular phone antennas		N
22	Clothing stores		P
23	Computer and software stores		P
24	Dry cleaning, with off premises cleaning		P
25	Dry cleaning, with on premises cleaning		S
26	Electronics and appliance stores		P
27	Florists		P
28	Furniture and home furnishing stores		P
29	Gift, novelty, and souvenir shops		P
30	Gun shops		N
31	Hardware stores		P
32	Hobby, toy, and game stores		P
33	Jewelry stores		P
34	Luggage and leather goods stores		P
35	Lumber and other building materials		N
36	Miscellaneous retail stores		S
37	Motor fuel service station		S
38	Motor fuel service station with minimarts		S
39	Motor vehicle body shops		N
40	Motor vehicle sales and rental		S
41	Motor vehicles repair and maintenance, not including bodywork		S
42	Musical instrument and supply stores		P
43	News dealers and newsstands (indoors)		P
44	News dealers and newsstands (outdoors)		N
45	Optical goods stores		P
46	Paint, glass and wallpaper stores		P
47	Parking facilities _ enclosed, not accessory to use on same lot		P
48	Parking facilities _ outdoor, not accessory to use on same lot, for noncommercial vehicles only (exception made for commercial vehicles temporarily parked in the course of providing deliveries or services)		P
49	vehicles only (exception made for commercial vehicles temporarily parked in the course of providing deliveries or services)		
50	Pawnshops		N
51	Pet and pet supplies stores		P
52	Prerecorded tape, CD and record stores		P
53	Rental stores (with outdoor storage)		N

#	LAND USES	C3 Central Com- mercial
54	Retail nurseries and garden stores	S
55	Retail _ temporary	N
56	Sewing, needlework and	P
57	Shoe stores	P
58	Sporting goods stores	P
59	Stationery stores	P
60	Tobacco stores	N
61	Used merchandise stores	N
62	Wholesale sales and distribution, no outside storage or display	S
63	Wholesale sales with storage of materials outdoors	N
64	ACCOMMODATIONS AND FOOD SERVICES	
65	Bars, taverns and cocktail lounges	N
66	Coffee shops	P
67	Convenience food marts	S
68	Dinner theaters	S
69	Fast food establishment	N
70	Hotels	S
71	Nursing homes and skilled care facilities	N
72	Restaurant _ drive- through	S
73	Restaurants operating outside the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 1:00 A.M.	S
74	Restaurants, sit down, greater than 5,000 square feet	S
75	Restaurants, sit down, less than 5,000 square feet	P
76	Specialty food stores	P
77	FINANCIAL, INSURANCE AND REAL ESTATE	
78	Commodity contract brokers, dealers	P
79	Financial institutions with drive-up window	S
80	Financial institutions without drive-up window	P
81	Insurance agents, brokers and service	P
82	Investment advisors	P
83	Real estate agents and managers	P
84	Security brokers and dealers	P
85	SERVICES	
86	Accounting, auditing and bookkeeping	P
87	Adult daycare facilities	S
88	Advertising agencies	P
89	Architectural, engineering and related services	P
90	Auto repossession/recovery	N
91	Barbershops	P
92	Beauty shops	P
93	Business and technical schools	S
94	Business consulting	P
95	Business operations involving the storage of hazardous materials	S
96	Business operations involving the storage of vehicles for more than 24 hours	S
97	Car wash	N
98	Commercial art and graphic design	P
99	Computer and data processing services	P
100	Currency exchange,	N
101	Direct mail advertising services	S
102	Electrical repair shops (small consumer appliances)	P
103	Employment agencies	P
104	Extermination and pest control services	S
105	Funeral homes	N
106	Labor organizations	N
107	Landscaping services	S
108	Legal services	P
109	Limousine service	S
110	Massage parlors	N
111	Massage therapy establishment	P
112	Medical equipment rental	P
113	Medical or dental offices, labs and outpatient surgical facilities	P
114	Pet care (except veterinary) services	S

#	LAND USES	C3 Central Com- mercial
115	Photocopying and duplicating services	S
116	Photographic studios, portrait	P
117	Political organizations	P
118	Private instructional facilities	P
119	Private mailing service	P
120	Professional organizations	P
121	Public postal service	N
122	Rail terminals _ commuter	N
123	Recycling centers _ drop off	N
124	Reupholsters and furniture repair	P
125	Secretarial and court reporting	P
126	Shoe repair and shoeshine parlors	P
127	Tanning salons	P
128	Tattoo parlor	N
129	Telemarketing bureaus	P
130	Towing operations (sole purpose)	N
131	Travel agents	P
132	Veterinary hospitals or clinics for small animals	N
133	Videotape and disk rental	P
134	Watch, clock, jewelry repair	P
135	INDUSTRIAL	
136	Canning and bottling facilities	N
137	Cellular phone antennas	N
138	Electrical distribution centers and utility substations	S
139	Manufacturing labs, testing facilities	S
140	Manufacturing, processing, assembly and packaging of biological and botanical products, except manure	N
141	Manufacturing, processing, assembly and packaging of merchandise from prepared materials, and pharmaceuticals, toiletries and	N
142	Metal fabrication facilities	N
143	Newspaper offices and	P
144	Vehicle and equipment storage yards - outdoor,	N
145	ENTERTAINMENT AND RECREATION	
146	Billiard/pool halls	N
147	Fitness and recreational sports centers - less than 10,000 square feet in floor and land area	P
148	Fitness and recreational sports centers - 10,000 square feet or more in floor and land area	N
149	Martial arts facilities	P
150	Off track betting facilities	N
151	Swimming pools _ private	N
152	Swimming pools _ public	N
153	Tennis, racquet and paddle ball courts _ private	N
154	Theaters for movie and drama _ commercial	P
155	Video game arcades	N
156	INSTITUTIONAL	
157	Colleges and universities	N
158	Convents, monasteries and seminaries	N
159	Hospitals and clinics	N
160	Houses of worship	N
161	Libraries	N
162	Membership organizations, related to recreational facilities and accessory buildings	S
163	Municipal buildings, structures and grounds	N
164	Museums, historical sites and like institutions	S
165	Parks, forest preserves, related recreational facilities, administrative offices and storage buildings	N
166	Schools, public and private, elementary, junior high and high schools	N
167	ACCESSORY USES	
168	Child daycare homes	P
169	Commissaries for students and faculty	N
170	Dormitories	N
171	Garages, parking	P
172	Rectories, parsonages and parish houses	P
173	Other accessory structures for mechanical equipment, storage of	N
	(Ord. 3270, 3-23-2009; amd. Ord. 3586, 2-29-2016)	